

REMARKS AND ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 11-14 are pending in the present application, of which claim 1 is the sole independent claim. Claims 2-10 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 1 has been amended. New claims 11-14 have been added. Support for the limitations of the new claims can be found in the specification as follows: claims 11,12 – page 2, lines 10-12, and original claim 4; claim 13 – page 2, lines 19-21; claim 14 – page 2, lines 22-24.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as not being enabled for polymers other than styrene polymers. Although Applicants do not agree with the basis for the rejection, to expedite prosecution of this application Applicants have amended claim 1 to limit it to styrene polymers, and accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Crosby. Crosby teaches a method for functionalization of polystyrene via halomethylation. The presently claimed polymer bead, which is functionalized with a 2-chlorotrityl chloride group is not disclosed or suggested by Crosby. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection should be withdrawn.

Moreover, Applicants have obtained superior results for amino acid loading of resins functionalized according to the present claims. Table 2 shows that an average amino acid (AA) loading efficiency (when in contact with 0.68 mmol of AA) of 77.9% was obtained for the resin of this invention, in contrast to 49.9% mmol for one commercial resin, 44.4% for another (even though in contact with higher AA amount of 0.73), and 42.5% for a third (at slightly lower AA of 0.61 mmol). Such improved performance could not have been predicted from the disclosures of the prior art. For this reason as well, Applicants believe that the present claims are patentable, and respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the application allowed.

Claims 3-5 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Crosby. Claims 3-5 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rieke, and claims 3-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rivier in combination with Crosby or Rieke. These rejections are moot in view of the cancelation of claims 3-10.

If the Examiner has any further objections to the application, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney

by telephone at (847) 649-3891 to discuss the remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth Crimaldi

Kenneth Crimaldi
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,968
Telephone No.: (847) 649-3891

Rohm and Haas Company
100 Independence Mall West
Philadelphia, PA 19106-2399
February 7, 2005